Remarks/Arguments

35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-5, 7-12, and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Krasner (US No. 5,825,327).

It is submitted that none of the cited references, including Krasner, teach or suggest:

"tuning circuitry operative to tune a first satellite television signal **and** a second satellite television signal" as recited by the currently amended claim 1. (emphasis added)

Furthermore, none of the cited references teach or suggest:
"obtain carrier frequency offset data of one of the first and second satellite television signals" and "provide the frequency stabilized oscillator signal via said communications line to uplink circuitry" as recited by the currently amended claim 1.

The present invention addresses the problem of errors generated by frequency differences or offsets present in two way satellite communication systems. The present invention solves this problem by receiving two incoming data streams with an outdoor unit of a satellite communications system from a satellite, measuring a frequency offset from one of the two data streams using an indoor unit of a satellite communications system, generating a frequency stabilized oscillator signal and providing the frequency stabilized oscillator signal to the outdoor unit for use as a reference oscillator to uplink circuitry in the outdoor unit and downlink circuitry in the outdoor unit. This frequency stabilized oscillator signal is provided to the outdoor unit via the same communications link on which the two incoming data streams are provided.

It is submitted that Krasner receives only one incoming satellite signal at a time. Switch 1 of Krasner is used to "select one of the two inputs to be outputted from the switch 1." (Col. 5, lines 1-2) Thus Krasner does not teach or suggest "tuning circuitry operative to tune a first satellite television signal and a second satellite television signal" as recited by the currently amended claim 1. Furthermore, Krasner does not teach or suggest "provide the frequency stabilized **oscillator** signal via said communications line to uplink circuitry" as recited by the currently amended claim 1. (emphasis added) Krasner teaches a system

wherein a frequency reference is generated for both a RF to IF converter in a receiver and an IF to RF converter for a transmitter. The frequency corrected RF signal is then supplied to a separately located RF transmitter. Krasner does not teach or suggest supplying the oscillator signal via the same communications line used to receive the satellite television signal. This feature is essential for two way satellite communication systems as home installations of satellite television systems traditionally use a single communications link between the outdoor unit and the indoor unit. Adding an additional communications link to accommodate the frequency stabilized oscillator signal would make the system undesirable from a practical standpoint.

It is submitted that since none of the cited references teach of suggest "tuning circuitry operative to tune a first satellite television signal and a second satellite television signal" or "obtain carrier frequency offset data of one of the first and second satellite television signals" and "provide the frequency stabilized oscillator signal via said communications line to uplink circuitry" as recited by the currently amended claim 1. Since claim 1 is novel and is not anticipated by any combination of the cited prior art it is submitted that claim 1 is allowable and such action is respectfully requested.

It is further submitted that independent claims 8 and 15 are also allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable. Such action is respectfully requested. Since dependent claims 2-7, 9-14, and 16-18 are dependent from allowable independent claims, that they too are allowable for at least the same reasons. Such action is respectfully requested.

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant's representative at (609) 734-6804, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

No fee is believed due. However, if a fee is due, please charge the additional fee to Deposit Account 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,

By: Brian J. Cromarty
Reg. No. L0027
Phone (609) 734-6804

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing Inc.
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312
June 27, 2007